



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ENGLISH JOURNAL

VOLUME IX

NOVEMBER 1920

NUMBER 9

PLAGIARISM IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

DORA V. SMITH

University High School, University of Minnesota

I suppose no teacher of English ever completed with her class the study of a Shakespearean play without meeting with the conscientious objectors, usually in the shape of some outspoken, practically minded small boys, who claim indignantly that Shakespeare was "nothing but a common plagiarist after all." From the first day of high-school English, they have listened to sermons on the evils of plagiarism and, in some cases, have learned from experience the tragic consequences of this serious offense. It is only natural, then, that when they read for the first time the carefully compiled list of sources commonly prefaced to the standard texts of Shakespeare, they refuse to acclaim that poet with the same honor he has traditionally had accorded to his name. Shakespeare is for them a fallen idol.

One of the chief reasons for this is that, in nine cases out of ten, it is the similarities and not the differences between the plays and their sources which are conscientiously recorded by the editor. We read, for instance, "I shall now give in full the chief passages from Lodge's novel, with references to the corresponding portions of the play. These will show that Shakespeare, not only followed the plot, but adopted also the phraseology of his predecessor." We may tell the students that plagiarism was common in Shakespeare's day, but even that fails to replace the dramatist upon his

pedestal. Too frequently, not being familiar with the facts ourselves, we give the non-committal reply so commonly found in critical books on the subject: "To conclude, what Shakespeare borrowed was the raw material of the drama. What he gave to this material was life and art." To the average student, such a reply means nothing. Shakespeare is not vindicated.

It was to answer the doubts of just such schoolboys that the following study was made. It aims to tell as briefly as possible certain similarities between the play and its sources, but to stress primarily the changes which make this play infinitely superior to its source, and worthy of the creative genius and artistic temperament of the dramatist. It includes more material than could be conveniently given to the class as a whole, but contains facts which we believe every teacher of *As You Like It* will find it helpful to know.

From the first appearance of *As You Like It*, probably in 1600, it was obvious that the poet was chiefly indebted for the story of his play to the romantic novel of Thomas Lodge, known as *Rosalynde, Euphues' Golden Legacie*, which had first appeared in 1590. A similar story had also been told in the medieval *Tale of Gamelyn*, formerly attributed to Chaucer. There is now little doubt but that Shakespeare used both of these works in the writing of the play.

In the story of Gamelyn, the makers of the will of Sir John of Bordeaux leave out of the inheritance entirely the youngest son, Gamelyn. Angered by this, Sir John, the father, changes the will, leaving everything to this, his favorite son. The plan of the father is accepted in the main by Lodge, giving the older son a real reason for jealousy against his brother; while in Shakespeare's play the brothers' plan is followed entirely. This at once enlists our sympathy for Orlando.

Shakespeare's Orlando receives much the same treatment at the hands of his brothers as does the medieval Gamelyn.¹ "His horses are bred better," complains Orlando; "for besides that they are fair with their feeding, they are taught their manage. . . .

¹ Act I, scene 1, ll. 9-11 and 16-18, Rolfe edition, 1905.

He lets me feed with his hinds, and bars me the place of a brother."¹
Comparison shows Gamelyn's fate similar.²

"Sone the elder brother gyled the yonge knave;
He took into his hand his land and his leede.
And Gamelyn himselfe to clothe and to feede.
He clothed him and fede him yvel and eek wrothe."

Lodge, in his novel, is content with having Saladyne use Rosader as a mean footboy, a circumstance not mentioned in either of the other accounts.

Again, Gamelyn keenly resents his brother's taunt,³ "Stonde Stille, gadeling," etc., replying, "Cristes curs mot he have that clepeth me gadeling—

I am no worse gadeling, ne no worse wight,
But born of a lady, and geten of a knight."

The words remind us distinctly of Orlando's remark,⁴ "I am no villain; I am the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys; he was my father, and he is thrice a villain that says such a father begot villains."

Another instance of the influence of the tale upon the drama is found in the fact that, in Shakespeare and the tale, it is Orlando or Gamelyn, who, in his youthful and exuberant strength, suggests the wrestling match, whereas Lodge makes him entirely the dupe of his brother's scheme.

The wrestling scene itself suggests several such parallels. In Gamelyn and Shakespeare the young man is taunted by the wrestler who calls him to the match, whereas in Lodge he is pulled in reluctantly by the shoulder. Lodge then commends the Franklin for showing no feeling when his sons are killed, while the drama and the tale make his grief a subject for much sympathy.

Two other speeches in Shakespeare, which are lacking in Lodge, find a close parallel in the tale. Touchstone, on entering the forest, declares, to the evident amusement of the audience,⁴

¹ *Tale* II, 70-73, "Tale of Gamelyn." Appendix to Skeat's *Chaucer*, Vol. IV (1894).

² *Tale* II, 102-7.

³ Act I, scene 1, ll. 52-55.

⁴ Act II, scene 4, ll. 13-15.

"Ay, now I am in Arden; the more fool I! When I was at home, I was in a better place." The speech is clearly reminiscent of the Adam of the tale, who declares upon his arrival in the forest,¹

"Now I see it is merry to be a spencer,
That lever me were keyes for to bere,
Than walken in this wild wolde, my clothes to tere."

It is of interest to note that "wilde wood" is also the expression of Jacques de Boys in Act V, scene 4, line 154.

These instances, it seems to us, are sufficient to justify the claim that Shakespeare did not follow the novel slavishly, but chose from the tale, as well, those incidents which would be of special dramatic value to the play.

Turning to the comparison of *As You Like It* with its chief source in Lodge, we discover that the changes wrought by the dramatist were many. They range themselves into three groups: first, changes in the plot, for dramatic effectiveness and unity of action; second, changes in the setting or atmosphere of the story; and third, changes in the characters given by Lodge as well as additions of new and important characters to the *dramatis personae*.

Let us notice first the changes as to plot. Shakespeare, with his keen sense of the dramatic value of his material, jumps at once into the heart of the story. He omits entirely the account of the virtues and death of the father, Sir John of Bordeaux, which covers the first dozen pages of Lodge's novel. The death-bed sermon of the old man to his sons and the final decision in regard to his legacy enter the drama only as antecedent facts, whereas in the novel they cover many tedious pages. The omission of this story, not only enables the dramatist to jump at once into the complications of the plot, but it also gives to the Orlando-Oliver story the more subordinate place which it ought to have, and the lack of which causes confusion in the Lodge novel. Throughout Shakespeare's play we have a clear sense of values, with the emphasis placed upon the Rosalind story and the banished-duke situation to which the other is necessarily subordinate. Furthermore, in his emphasis upon the older brother's envy of Orlando's nobility

¹ *Tale* 11, 620-23.

of character and appealing personality, the poet not only raises Orlando from the first in our estimation, but motivates farther the Oliver events, having almost entirely removed Lodge's single motive of avarice.

Again, Shakespeare avoids the grosser, more crude scenes of the Saladyne-Rosader (Oliver-Orlando) story, which are not in keeping with the quiet pastoral tone of the drama. After the first disagreement, for instance, Saladyne orders his men to seize Rosader, who, being a youth of hasty action, lifts a rake from the garden wall, and forces his brother and his men into a quick retreat. In this respect Lodge reminds us of the more impulsive scenes of the medieval tale, in which Gamelyn goes even so far as to club his brother's porter to death, afterward throwing him down the well. In this way also, Shakespeare avoids the many forced reconciliations which grow out of such scenes in Lodge. For instance, following fast upon the rake-waving scene, we read,¹ "Upon these sugared reconciliations the brothers went into the house arm in arm together, to the great content of all the old servants of Sir John of Bordeaux"; which reconciliation Lodge might have added, speedily paved the way for circumstances leading to the next fight. Such rowdyism is absent in Shakespeare, who builds up gradually the increasing wrongs of the younger brother and the injustices of the other until the final separation comes.

It is in the wrestling scene that we find the first meeting of the Orlando and Rosalind plots. In Lodge's account, Torismund, the duke, welcomes Rosader as the son of an old friend, while in Shakespeare the duke regrets his relationship to one of his enemies. Here the fact that Sir Rowland was revered by Rosalind's father brings the lovers still closer together. The duke's wrath against the house of Sir Rowland gives a further basis for his banishment of Oliver, and brings into later complications the motive of a personal grudge.

After leaving the wrestling match, Rosader (in the Lodge story) returns with his friends to find his brother's gate locked against him; whereupon he breaks in, routs his brother, and

¹ Lodge, *Rosalynde*, p. 13, W. W. Greg (1907).

banquets his friends. Upon Saladyne's return, a reconciliation is effected through the efforts of old Adam Spencer. The crafty Saladyne, with a band of men, then breaks into his brother's bedroom at night, seizes him, and binds him to a post in the dining-room, where he remains three days, supposedly without food. During this time he is befriended by Adam, who, in the midst of a banquet of relatives designed to torment the starving Rosader, releases him and aids him in routing the guests. The two then meet the sheriff's band sent against them by Saladyne and, after finally overcoming them, escape to the forest of Arden. Such horseplay is avoided in Shakespeare, whose elevation of the whole story is nowhere better exemplified than in the dignified and sorrowful farewell of Adam and Orlando on their departure from the old home of Sir Rowland de Boys.

In the scene of the duke's banishment of Rosalind, Lodge has Alinda (*Aliena*) plead for her, and so incurs her father's wrath and her banishment. Shakespeare, who leaves her to banish herself of her own accord, ennobles her character, and leaves the duke in ignorance of her departure. Her father, fearing for her popularity in the court, banishes the more appealing Rosalind, whereas Torismund does the deed from a much more selfish motive, fearing that some powerful peer of his court will marry Rosalind and claim his throne. Shakespeare, in casting suspicion upon Orlando also, links the two plots still more closely, and furnishes a real motive for the banishment of Oliver, which in Lodge's story is done because of the duke's grief at the loss of a newly found warrior. One of the best devices for dramatic suspense introduced by Shakespeare lies in the fact that both Orlando and Rosalind are in ignorance of each other's banishment. The fact that in Lodge, upon his arrival in the court of the banished duke, Rosader sorrowfully relates the banishment of Rosalind, rather leads one to feel that he should early have suspected her presence together with Celia's in the persons of the disguised Ganymede and his shepherdess sister.

The way in which Shakespeare makes a striking dramatic scene out of one of Lodge's tiresome episodes is well shown in the sonnet scene between Rosalind, Celia, Jacques, Orlando, and Touchstone. In the novel we read that Rosader, having pinned

his sonnet to a tree, sits down to weep over his fate. Alinda and Rosalind, coming upon him, recognize him at once before the sonnet attracts their attention.¹ "They saw the sudden change of his looks," says Lodge, "his folded arms, his passionate sighs. They heard him often abruptly call on Rosalynde, who, poor soul, was as hotly burned as himself, but that she shrouded her pains in the cinders of honorable modesty." Immediately she asks the forester if he mourns the banished Rosalind, upon whom she showers no end of flattering epithets, and in whose name she audaciously announces that² "faint heart ne'er won fair lady." Upon this he pulls from his pocket a second lengthy sonnet to which its subject listens in sentimental ecstasy.

Shakespeare's management of this scene is quite different. As Rosalind enters reading with much amusement the verses she has found on a nearby tree, she breaks in upon the conversation of Corin and Touchstone. The latter adds to the humor of the situation by parodying the love verses on Rosalind. Celia follows, reading a still more lengthy sonnet, which she has just plucked from a tree, and an animated discussion takes place as to who the lover is. With many interruptions and ill-concealed excitement on the part of Rosalind, Celia reveals the secret of her finding Orlando in the forest. Just then Orlando enters, telling Jacques the story of his love. The scorn of the malcontent and the knowledge of Rosalind's presence among the trees, greatly enhances the listener's enjoyment of such sayings as "just as high as my heart" and others. The departure of Jacques gives Rosalind the chance to taunt the lover with the signs of his disease and to suggest the possible cure for it. Through the scene she is master of the situation, cleverly conceals her identity, and, above all, avoids all reference to herself and her perfections.

Another evidence of Shakespeare's careful linking of the parts of the plot occurs in the incident of the reconciliation of the brothers and the accident of Orlando. Entirely his own invention is Orlando's pledge to Rosalind that he will return at two o'clock. His failure to do so necessitates Oliver's return with the bloody napkin to tell the story to the ladies. All this is entirely omitted

¹ Lodge, *Rosalynde*, p. 67, W. W. Greg (1907).

² *Ibid.*, p. 69.

in Lodge, who delays three days before allowing the news of the affair to reach Ganymede and his sister.

The last important change made by Shakespeare in the plot occurs in the last act. After the weddings are over, Lodge has the whole party return to the cottage home for the wedding feast. While this is going on, the student brother of Saladyne and Rosader enters to announce a battle going on between the friends of the banished duke and the reigning lord and his supporters. Immediately the duke and his men rush out and kill Torismund and rout his followers. Thereupon the merry party returns to Paris to live happily ever after. Shakespeare naturally desired to leave all bloodshed out of his quiet, pastoral drama. He therefore has the usurping duke met on his entrance into the forest by a pious monk, who persuades him to give up the throne to his banished brother and close his days in penitence in a nearby cell. This he does, peaceably though none the less unreasonably, hence paving the way for the future happiness of the senior duke and his band of lovers.¹

Where Shakespeare got this close has recently been pointed out by Professor Stoll² in his comparison between this play and John Marston's *The Malcontent*. His article proves that *The Malcontent* may well be added to the list of sources of *As You Like It*, because of the many suggestions the dramatist received from it.

In *The Malcontent* there rules in Genoa a usurping duke, Pietro Iacomo, at whose accession his brother, Duke Altofront, was banished. The latter, disguised as Malevole, the malcontent, finds his way back to the throne through the machinations of the villain, Mendozo. After innumerable dangers and complications, the usurper gives up the throne, exclaiming:²

I heere renounce forever regencie
 O Altofront! I wrong thee to supplant thy right. . . .
 O, I am changed! fore heerefore the dread power,
 In true contrition I doe dedicate
 My breath to solitarie holinesse,
 My lippes to praier; and my breast's care shall be,
 Restoring Altofront to regencie.

¹ *Modern Philology*, III, 281.

² *The Malcontent*, Act IV, scene 5, p. 270.

Hearing this, Malevole throws off his disguise and accepts the throne.

The second group of changes made by Shakespeare in the play have to do largely with setting and atmosphere. One can see at a glance that Shakespeare has set his scenes at a romantic distance from any known or definitely located place. In vain do we ask ourselves over what kingdom the duke was ruler; nor do we know the geographical location of the forest of Arden. It is simply a charmingly romantic forest where "time fleets carelessly" and oak trees "whose boughs are moss'd with age" bend over the swift, running brooks to whose waters come the sequestered stags of the woodland. Not a creature troubles its stillness save one lonely lioness who is so obliging as to come out from hiding at precisely the moment she is needed, and at no other.

Lodge's forest of Arden, on the other hand, is definitely located, not far from the city of Bordeaux and within easy access of Paris. Rosalind and Aliena, we learn, on their journey to Arden¹ "traveled along the vineyards, and by many byways at last got to the forest side, where they traveled by the space of two or three days without seeing any creature, being often in danger of wild beasts." Again,² "passing thus on along, about midday they came to a fountain compassed with a grove of cypress trees, so cunningly and curiously planted, as if some goddess had entreated nature in that place to make her an arbor."

One does not read far in Lodge's story without becoming oppressed with the closeness of the atmosphere. The fresh breezes of rural England would be stifled among its closely twined branches. It is the odor of perfumes and cosmetics, the stamp of artificiality which prevails, not the fragrant wafts of the pure air of the countryside. A single instance will suffice to illustrate the difference. As Alinda and her cousin sank down in weariness in the forest, "the ground where they sat was diapered with Flora's riches, as if she meant to wrap Tellus in the glory of her vestments; round about in the form of an amphitheater were most curiously planted trees, interseamed with lemons and citrons, which with the thickness of their boughs so shadowed the place that Phoebus

¹ Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

could not pry into the secret of that arbor; so united were the tops with so thick a closure, that Venus might there in her jollity have dallied unseen with her dearest paramour. Fast by, to make the place more gorgeous, was there a fount, so crystallin and clear, that it seemed Diana with her Dryades and Hamadryades had that spring as the secret of all their bathings."

Nowhere does Shakespeare ring so true as in his shepherd scenes. Far from the insipidity of the shepherds of Lodge, who sit by the hour in the shady bower near the refreshing fountain, Shakespeare's savor of the earth from which they are sprung. As they meander through the forest, Lodge's sentimental shepherds spend their time singing amorous eclogues in verse of their own composing. On the arrival of the wanderers, Corydon approaches Alinda in the manner of an Elizabethan courtier, bowing low as he addresses her:¹ "If I should not, fair damsel, occasion offense, or renew your griefs by rubbing the scar, I would fain crave so much favor as to know the cause of your misfortunes, and why, and whither you wander with your page in so dangerous a forest."

Small wonder that such a shepherd quotes Latin glibly, writes sonnets in French, and thoughtfully philosophizes on the envy of degree and the vicissitudes of fortune!

How different is the Corin of *As You Like It*. His only philosophy is summed up in the lines² "the the more one sickens, the worse at ease he is; that the property of rain is to wet and fire to burn"; and last but not most important of all, that "good pasture makes fat sheep." That is all he knows or needs to know. After arguing in vain with Touchstone over the handling of ewes and the care of sheep, he makes his position clear: "Sir, I am a true laborer: I earn that I eat, get that I wear; and the greatest of my pride is to see my ewes graze and my lambs suck."³

In such scenes as these we look in vain for the "exact phraseology" of Lodge and realize the consummate genius of their writer.

Having compared the plot and the atmosphere of the novel and the play, let us turn to the characters themselves. First, there are the changes made in the characters borrowed. The most

¹ Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

² Act III, scene 2, ll. 21-30.

³ Act III, scene 2, ll. 66-71.

prominent, of course, are Rosalind and Celia, who are scarcely recognizable except for situation. So great is the change which has come over them that we may almost name them among Shakespeare's distinct creations. Furnival, in his introduction to the Leopold edition of Shakespeare's work declares *As You Like It* to be "the sweetest and happiest of Shakespeare's comedies; sweetest, because the sweetness has been drawn from the bitters of life; happiest, because the happiness has sprung from, has overcome, sorrow and suffering. What we most prize is misfortune borne with cheery mind, the sun of man's spirit shining through and dispensing the clouds that strive to shade it." It is precisely this cheery spirit of Rosalind which removes her entirely from the plain of Lodge's Rosalynde and which, pervading the play as a whole, transforms it into a creation of Shakespeare's own. Lodge's Rosalynde is morbidly self-conscious; Shakespeare's full of sprightliness and humor. On the appearance of her father, the duke, just before her wedding, Rosalynde is reported to have "smothered her melancholy with a shadow of mirth." This was her liveliest attempt at joyfulness. No less than eight times we learn that Rosalynde was "in a dump" or just rousing herself from it. Her love affair prospered fairly, and she listened again and again to the amorous verses of her lover. But what do we read? "Rosalynde, poor soul, that had love her loadstar, and her thoughts set on fire with the flame of fancy, could take no rest, but being alone, began to consider what passionate penance poor Rosader was enjoined to by love and fortune." Indeed, "poor soul" was her most frequent appellation.

Along with her morbidity, she has a forwardness little akin to Shakespeare's heroine. In her first meeting with Rosader, she hints at the virtues of Rosalynde in order to sigh at his praises of her. At length she persuades Rosader to bring more sonnets next morning, and by no means allows him to forget them. At another time she flatters him that he is³ "worthy of as fair as she" but turns away to mourn that "the match is not yet so surely made, but he may miss of his market." Quite different is this from the coy yet independent Rosalind, who turns the thoughts of her

¹ Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

² *Ibid.*, p. 73.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

lover from her own virtues to the absurdity of his own situation and mockingly begs him to woo her, for she is in¹ "a holiday humor." It is that very humor which bids her retort²: "You a lover! and you serve me such another trick, never come in my sight more!"

Alinda, too, lacks the retiring gentleness of Shakespeare's Celia. The dramatist uses her as a soft-toned background for the more brilliant qualities of her cousin. In Lodge, Alinda is pushed forward on a level with Rosalynde, and as a result neither is entirely distinct. Bashfulness is unknown to her. It is she who accosts the shepherd and arranges their lodgings while her page stands to one side. The Aliena who³ "cannot say the words" when Rosalind proposes the mock marriage is quite differently conceived from her who, in Lodge, herself suggests the wedding. But the most astonishing example of her indecorum is in her love-making with Saladyne (Oliver) where she actually snatches from his pocket the sonnets she suspects are addressed to herself, in order to discover without a doubt the object of his devotion.

Rosader bears the same relation to Orlando as does Rosalynde to her Shakespearean prototype. The dignity and nobility so much envied by Oliver are sadly lacking in Lodge's character. Again and again Rosader is the dupe of his brother, who looks upon him as a reveler worthy of no respect. There is so little depth to his character that immediately after suffering most from the treachery of his brother, he succumbs to him in tearful reconciliation, and walks blindly into the next trap set in his way. Once in the trap, he manifests some cleverness in working his way out, though usually it is through startling feats of brute force. All this is changed in Shakespeare, whose Orlando, though manly and robust, is above the use of force save in the greatest extremity. On this subject he speaks some of the greatest lines in the play. Abashed at his own incivility in challenging the duke and his men with drawn sword in hand, he exclaims remorsefully:⁴

You touch'd my vein at first: the thorny point
Of bare distress hath ta'en from me the show

¹ Act III, scene 2.

³ Act IV, scene 1, l. 114.

² Act IV, scene 1, l. 35.

⁴ Act II, scene 7, ll. 94-98.

Of smooth civility; yet am I inland bred
 And know some nurture. . . .
 Let gentleness my strong enforcement be;¹
 In the which hope I blush and hide my sword.

Such manliness is absent in Rosader. Like Rosalynde, he too often retreats to the corner with his sighs and tears. Upon his arrival in Arden the duke moves him to tell his story, which he does,² "first beginning his exordium with a volley of sighs, and a few lukewarm tears." Such is the Rosader who proves meet companion for Lodge's Rosalynde.

Shakespeare makes out of Lodge's Adam a character full of dignity and pathos. The original servant, though devoted to the family and anxious to bring peace between the brothers, once friction comes between them, shows himself most keen in the arts of war. He is younger than Shakespeare's Adam, and runs off gleefully to the forest of Arden, though later tiring of his bargain. The Adam in *As You Like It* is perhaps the most typically English character in the play, belonging to that time-honored class of devoted family servants whose great numbers called forth the astonishment and admiration of Washington Irving two centuries later. Scorned by the older brother and cast aside with the slur of "dog" he attempts no striking back, but hobbles off the stage, pathetically murmuring,³ "God be with my old master! he would not have spoke such a word!" There is no scene in the play more full of dignity and pathos than that in which Orlando and the aged servant leave the old home. Here it is Adam who presents to his old master the five hundred crowns so carefully saved during his years of service in the family, and says the words with which he has immortalized himself:⁴

Master go on and I will follow thee,
 To the last gasp, with truth and loyalty.

The characters not appearing in Lodge, which may be called purely Shakespearean creations, are chiefly William, Audrey, Touchstone, and Jacques. William, who has been likened to the

¹ *Ibid.*, ll. 118-19.

³ Act I, scene 1, l. 76.

² Lodge, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴ Act II, scene 3, ll. 69-70.

pearl within the oyster shell, reveals in his twenty lines a character full of good will toward his rival and devotion toward Audrey. Shakespeare had an eye for plot symmetry. Since Phoebe had her Silvius, and Ganymede her Phoebe, Audrey must have her second devotee, partly to reconcile her, and partly to prove to Touchstone the virtue of his choice.

Audrey herself is a country bumpkin without wit, without understanding even, but with a big heart and a huge laugh. It is one of the chief sources of comedy in the play that such a creature should become the wife of Touchstone, chief of Shakespeare's wits. It was Shakespeare's plan that this supreme wit coupled with supreme dullness should "take off," as it were, the romantic lovers of the play. Since Touchstone scorned matrimony, yet found it extremely "catching" in such an atmosphere, he determined to prove his scorn of love by marrying someone about whom he was supremely indifferent.

Touchstone is generally conceded to be the greatest, as well as the most high-toned, clown in all Shakespeare. His devotion to Celia and Rosalind gives him withal a human quality rarely present in fools of his type. One of the chief sources of humor in him is his feeling of lordly superiority among the boorish shepherds of Arden, and his enjoyment of their discomfort in the presence of his superior wisdom. He philosophizes on the damnable manners of the country and gives learned sermons on love, all in the same breath! With his usual quick wit he makes off-hand rhymes on Rosalind, being privileged even to such taunts as

Sweetest nut hath sourest rind
Such a nut is Rosalind.¹

"Peace, you dull fool,"² is his only reprimand, for like Jacques, he has a freedom all his own. It was the deeper satirical vein in Touchstone which appealed to Jacques. Such a man, he says, has "leave to speak his mind, and although he smart, men but seem senseless of the bob."³ *As You Like It* without Touchstone

¹ Act III, scene 2, ll. 98-99.

² *Ibid.*, l. 105.

³ Act II, scene 7, l. 55.

would be as salt that has lost its savor. He is the very life of the play, the life so sadly lacking in Lodge's *Rosalynde*.¹

Jacques has for many years been considered chief of Shakespeare's original characters in this play. But within the last few years Professor Stoll has pointed out an evident source for this type of character in John Marston's *Malcontent*. A brief summary of the similarities and differences between the two characters will show admirably how little plagiarism there is in Shakespeare's use of his sources. Certain likenesses are self-evident. Neither is an ordinary human being, but appears in the professional garb of cynicism and melancholy. Both are on excellent terms with the fool, and enjoy his privilege of freedom of speech. Both are admired by the duke and scorned by their fellows. Both are most at home in their soliloquies, and enjoy the jarring sounds of discordant music. One of the strongest points of similarity is the manner in which each parcels out the characters in the end. Jacques, having declared his intention of going into solitude, turns to the others in the group:²

(To Duke.) You to your former honor I bequeath;

Your patience and your virtue well deserves it:—

(To Orlando.) You to a lover that your true faith doth merit:—

(To Oliver.) You to your land and love, and great allies:—

(To Silvius.) You to a long and well deserved bed:—

(To Touchstone.) And you to wrangling; for thy loving voyage

Is but for two months victualled:—

So, to your pleasures;

I am for other than for dancing measures.

¹ There is a slight reminiscence in Touchstone of Passarello, the fool in Marston's *The Malcontent*. Although the logic of these two clowns is typical of much of dramatic motley, there may be some connection between the two, especially as both are friends of the *Malcontent* in their respective plays. The logic by which Passarello proves that a great quarreler is an arrant coward reminds one of Touchstone's deductions in regard to damnation for bad manners ("The *Malcontent*," J. O. Halliwell's *Marston's Dramatic Work*, Vol. II). "He that quarrels seekes to fight; and he that seekes to fight, seekes to dye; and he that seekes to dye seekes never to fight more; and he that will quarrell and seekes meanes never to answer a man more, I think hees a coward" (Act V, scene 1, p. 273).

Touchstone uses the same method of reasoning in his remarks to Corin in Act III, scene 2, l. 38 to 42. "Why, if thou never wast at court, thou never saw'st good manners, then thy manners must be wicked; and wickedness is sin and sin is damnation. Thou art in a parlous state, shepherd!"

²Act V, scene 4, ll. 180-88.

Malevole, after the success of his plans and the throwing off of disguises at the dance, kicks out Mendoza and turns to the bystanders:¹

(*To Piestro and Aurelia.*) "You to your vows; and thou unto the suburbs,

(*To Maquerelle.*) You to my worst friend I would hardly give.

(*To Bilioso.*) Thou art a perfect olde knave, all pleased to live.

You unto my breast (*To Celso and the captain.*) thou to my
hart (*Maria*)

The rest of idle actors idly part.

And as for me I here assume my right

To which I hope all's pleas'd. To all good night.

It is a tribute to the consummate genius of Shakespeare that the likeness between the two characters ends here. For in Jacques Shakespeare has given us one of the most distinctive characters in all literature. He is essentially a man apart, with a melancholy "all his own," and one in which he takes a keen satisfaction. The poet has made him a purely contemplative character, who stands as an onlooker upon life and takes no part in it. Here he is in direct contrast to Malevole, who has in his nature many of the characteristics of a true villain and prosecutes his schemes for the downfall of others with an almost devilish delight. In the end he parcels out the characters to fates which he himself has created through the intrigue of his own mind and heart. It is not so with Jacques, who descends from the loftiness of his position to recognize the fates of his fellows as he leaves them to pursuits in which, in the future as well as in the past, he will have no part. "Discord to malcontents is very manna"² is typical of Malevole, who said it, but how untrue of Jacques, who shuns intercourse with the troublesome things of the world!

In the second place Jacques has no special grudge against any particular person. It is his habit rather "to rail against *all* the first-born of Egypt." There is nothing in his past which he has to avenge. Envy and revenge have no part in his nature, while they are back of Malevole's every move. "Will you sit down with me?" says Jacques, "and we two will rail against our mistress,

¹ *The Malcontent*, Act V, scene 3, l. 292.

² *The Malcontent*, Act I, scene 4, l. 213.

the world, and all our misery."¹ The grudge which Jacques bears against the world is purely impersonal.

Critics of Shakespeare disagree largely as to the likableness of the character of Jacques. Many cast him aside as a cynic, while just as many welcome him as a genial, fairly jovial fellow. Surely at the end of the play he leaves no bitterness in the scene when he commits each one to that happiness which he recognizes, however cynically, as the just reward of their virtue. The old duke "loved to cope with him," Shakespeare tells us. But, it may be objected, so did Pietro with Malevole. True, he does remark, "I like him: faith, he gives me good intelligence to my spirit."² But in the same speech we read, "His highest delight is to procure others vexation." Truly, we may say, here is one point scored for the duke's bad taste, rather than one for the geniality of Malevole.

We need only to notice the way in which we are introduced to the two men in order to see the difference in their characters. Long before he appears on the stage, Jacques is represented to us as lying on the bank of a swift brook, weeping over the stag fallen in the chase. Tenderness, even a certain human sympathy, overspreads his cynicism at all times. Contrast this with the first speech of Malevole, who calls from his chamber window:³ "Yaugh, godaman, what dost thou there? Dukes Janimed Junoes jealous of thy long stockings. Shadowe of a woman, what wouldst, weesell? . . . thou lambe a court—what dost thou bleat for?—a you smooth chind catamite."

How infinitely below Jacques is his character will be seen at a glance, in any of his typical conversations. Low class is stamped on his every word, whereas Jacques is ever the gentleman. Take this single instance from his conversation with Bilioso, the old marshall:⁴

Mal: (tormentingly): I shall now leave ye with all my best wishes.

Bil: Out ye Curre!

Mal: Onely let's hold together a firm correspondence.

Bil: Out!

¹ *As You Like It*, Act II, scene 2, l. 260.

³ *Ibid.*, Act I, scene 2, l. 206.

² *The Malcontent*, Act I, scene 2, l. 206.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Act II, scene 3, l. 230.

Mal: A mutual, friendly, reciprocally, perpetually kind of steddily, unanimous, heartily leagued—

Bil: Hence, ye grosse jaw'd pesantly. Out! . . . go!

Mal: Adué, pigeon-house! thou burr that onely stickest to nappy fortunes—the sarpego, the strangury, an eternally, uneffectual priapisme seise thee!

One feels it almost slander on the name of Shakespeare to say that Jacques is a recast of such a character. Malevole no doubt suggested to Shakespeare the possibilities of the type; but how infinitely superior Jacques is can be realized only by a reading of the two plays.